

***Remarks***

Reconsideration of this Application respectfully is requested.

Applicant notes that in the Advisory Action issued June 29, 2009, the Examiner indicated that the claim amendments submitted with the After Final response filed on June 19, 2009 would be entered.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-6, 10-12, 16-22, and 40-46 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 16, and 40 being the independent claims. Claims 23-39 previously were cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Claims 1, 16, and 40 are sought to be amended to clarify the claims. Claims 41-46 are sought to be added. Support for these amendments and new claims is found at least at, for example, paragraphs [0017], [0048], [0058], and [0065] of the instant specification. These changes are believed not to introduce any new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication, at page 2 of the Office Action, that the Information Disclosure Statement submitted on February 11, 2009 is being considered.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-6, 16, 20-22, and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Adobe Acrobat 5.0 released 12 March 2001 as evidenced by "Adobe Acrobat 5.0 User's Guide for Chambers" (hereinafter "Acrobat") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0077985 to Kobata *et al.* ("Kobata") and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0052981 to Yasuda ("Yasuda").

With regard to the Examiner's statements on page 2 of the Advisory Action issued June 29, 2009, in which the Examiner continues to characterize Adobe as modified by Kobata and Yasuda as disclosing all of the features recited in claims 1, 16 and 40, Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses for the reasons stated below.

In the Advisory Action issued June 29, 2009, the Examiner states, which Applicant does not acquiesce to, that the arguments presented in the After Final reply filed on June 19, 2009 "that Adobe, Kobata and Yasuda fail to teach storing designated content to a clipboard application and preventing subsequent storage of the designated content in a second destination application via the clipboard application if is determined that the source file is the secured file ... merely attacks the Kobata reference." Applicant notes that as the Examiner's assertions in the final Office Action issued on April 21, 2009 with regards to the alleged security features of Acrobat and Yasuda are addressed in the following remarks.

Applicant submits that the applied references, singly, or in the allegedly obvious combination do not describe each and every element as set forth in independent claims 1, 16, and 40.

On pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action, claims 16 and 40 were rejected based on the same rationale applied to claim 1. Claims 16 and 40 recite a method and a computer readable medium, respectively with distinguishing features similar to claim 1. Although Applicant believes there are patentable difference between previously pending independent claims 1, 16, and 40 and the applied references, for other reasons, and in order to expedite prosecution, Applicant has amended claims 1, 16, and 40. Claims 1, 16, and 40 as amended herein, recite, *inter alia*:

- receiving a copy selection associated with designated content of a source file being displayed by a first source application;
- storing the designated content to the clipboard application;
- determining whether the source file is a secured file, wherein the secured file cannot be accessed without a file key available to an authenticated user; and
- preventing subsequent usage of the designated content in a second destination application via the clipboard application if it is determined that the source file is the secured file.

Applicant submits that the applied references, in the sections cited by the Examiner, or in other sections, contain no teaching or suggestion of determining whether the source file is a secured file, wherein the secured file cannot be accessed without a file key available to an authenticated user, as recited in claims 1, 16, and 40.

The Examiner asserts that Acrobat discloses determining whether the source file is a secured file (Office Action, page 3) and that Yasuda's clipboard canceller feature teaches "preventing subsequent usage of the designated content in a second destination application via the clipboard application if it is determined that the source file is the secured file" (Advisory Action, page 2). While Acrobat may describe that "[u]sers can set passwords to prevent others from viewing, editing or printing certain documents ... during the editing process" and that PDF documents can be password protected (Acrobat,

pages 28 and 29), Acrobat contains no teaching or suggestion of determining whether the source file is a secured file, wherein the secured file cannot be accessed without a file key available to an authenticated user, as recited in claims 1, 16, and 40.

Yasuda may suggest that “the copy suppress processing part 53 determines whether or not to suppress copying of data” by referring “to the definition file 4 to determine whether or not the clipboard canceller is set to "ON".” (Yasuda, paragraph [0138]). However, Yasuda's clipboard canceller is not analogous to a file key available to an authenticated user as recited in claims 1, 16, and 40. In contrast to what is recited in claims 1, 16, and 40, Yasuda discloses that “the system manager sets a clipboard canceller to suppress or allow the copy operation by the user”, “sets "ON" to the clipboard canceller in order to suppress copying of data through a clipboard, or sets "OFF" to the clipboard canceller in order to allow to copy data through the clipboard“, and “saves a setting of the clipboard canceller to the definition file” (Yasuda, paragraphs [0130] and [0131]). Thus, Yasuda's clipboard canceller feature is clearly limited to a binary "ON" "OFF" setting selected by a system manager that is saved to a definition file. Yasuda further describes that the system manager's selections saved to a definition file are made on a per-application, not per-file basis in order to suppress or allow application menu items and functions (Yasuda, paragraphs [0053]-[0059] and [0066] and FIGs. 1 and 3). Thus, Yasuda fails to disclose, teach, or suggest determining whether the source file is a secured file, wherein the secured file cannot be accessed without a file key available to an authenticated user, as recited in claims 1, 16, and 40. The deficiencies of Acrobat and Yasuda are not cured by Kobata. Kobata is not stated to teach or suggest, nor does Kobata teach or suggest, at least the above noted distinguishing features of claims 1, 16, and 40.

Moreover, on page 3 of the Office Action the Examiner acknowledges that Acrobat does not disclose preventing subsequent usage and storage of the designated content in a second destination application via the clipboard application if it is determined that the source file is the secured file, as recited in claims 1, 16, and 40. Rather, the Examiner relies on Kobata and Yasuda to cure the acknowledged deficiencies of Acrobat.

Kobata and Yasuda do not cure the deficiencies of Acrobat with regards to claims 1, 16, and 40.

On pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action the Examiner asserts, which Applicant does not acquiesce to, that Kobata “teaches preventing cut/paste (i.e., clipboard) operations from being used to copy a protected document into another application” and that “Yasuda teaches receiving a copy command, storing the designated content and then determining whether the content can be used” and that “it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the Kobata et al. method of preventing clipboard operations for secure documents to prevent copying from a secured PDF to an unsecured Word perfect document and to [receive] a copy command, [store] the designated content and then determining whether the content can be used.” Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assertions.

Yasuda fails to teach or suggest receiving a copy selection associated with designated content of a source file being displayed by a first source application and storing the designated content to the clipboard application, as recited in claims 1, 16, and 40. While Yasuda may generally describe data transfer by an operating system (OS) “at a copy-from to the clipboard”, Yasuda does not define what is meant by a “copy-from” (Yasuda, paragraph [0132]). Yasuda also lacks any teaching or suggestion of storing

designated content of a source file being displayed by a first source application to a clipboard application, as recited in claims 1, 16, and 40. Instead of the above-noted distinguishing features of claims 1, 16, and 40; Yasuda merely describes data transfers by an OS to a clipboard, wherein the transferred is data on the display unit of a user terminal associated with a user's copy operation (Yasuda, paragraph [0134]). Applicant submits that an OS data transfer from a terminal display is not analogous to receiving a copy selection associated with designated content of a source file being displayed by a first source application, as recited in claims 1, 16, and 40.

Yasuda explicitly “prohibit[s] copying of data through the clipboard” by suppressing copying of data and replacing “data with empty data in the clipboard” (Yasuda, paragraphs [0132]-[0139] and [0142]). Yasuda may discuss prohibiting or suppressing copying of data through a clipboard by suppressing the display of an application menu item (Yasuda, paragraphs [0011], [0012], [0045], and [0143] and FIGs. 1-3). However, Yasuda is silent regarding the capability of receiving a copy selection associated with designated content of a source file being displayed by a first source application and then storing the designated content to the clipboard application, as recited, using respective language, in claims 1, 16, and 40. In contrast to the above-noted distinguishing features of claims 1, 16, and 40; Yasuda's method controls copying of data by clearing content of a clipboard when the notice for copying data is detected and copying “the content (actually no data) in the clipboard” (Yasuda, paragraphs [0016], [0017] and [0048]).

Acrobat, Kobata, and Yasuda, taken singly or in the allegedly obvious combination do not teach or suggest storing designated content to a clipboard application and preventing subsequent storage of the designated content in a second destination

application via the clipboard application if it is determined that the source file is the secured file.

Kobata may generally describe how “digital content 1805 being viewed with the viewer 1820 (e.g., in a partial window on a computer screen) is prevented from being copied and pasted to another application” (Kobata, paragraph [0222]). However, Kobata fails to teach or suggest storing the designated content to the clipboard application, as recited in independent claims 1, 16, and 40. In contrast to the above-noted distinguishing features of claims 1, 16, and 40; Kobata discloses that “digital content 1805 being viewed with the viewer 1820 (e.g., in a partial window on a computer screen) may be prevented from being copied and pasted to another application” and that viewer 1820 is limited to “manipulating the digital content once authorization to manipulate the digital content 1805 is determined”, “may be particular to the type of digital content 1805 being controlled”, and “may perform ... authorization, identification, digital rights modification and decryption procedures as necessary” (Kobata, paragraphs [0214] and [0222]). In contrast to storing designated content to a clipboard application, as recited, using respective language, in claims 1, 16, and 40; Kobata's system stores “digital content” in an “electronic virtual warehouse” or in the memory of a computer device (Kobata, paragraphs [0089] and [0098]).

Therefore, Yasuda and Kobata do not cure the deficiencies of Acrobat, and cannot be used to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Thus, the allegedly obvious combination of Acrobat, Kobata, and Yasuda does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of claims 1, 16, and 40.

For at least these reasons, independent claims 1, 16, and 40 are allowable over the applied references. Reconsideration and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 10-12 and 17-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Acrobat in view of Kobata and Yasuda, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0037253 to Blank *et al.* (hereinafter "Blank") (Office Action, page 4). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 2-6 and 10-12, which depend upon claim 1, are allowable for at least being dependent from allowable independent claim 1, in addition to their own respective distinguishing features. See *In Re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and M.P.E.P. § 2143.03.

At least based on their respective dependencies upon independent claim 16, claims 17-22 should be found allowable, as well as for their additional respective distinguishing features.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and remove the rejections of claims 1-6, 16, 20-22, and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and pass these claims to allowance.

***Rejoinder of Withdrawn Claims***

Applicant respectfully requests that the subject matter of previously withdrawn claims 7-9 and 13-15, which are cancelled herein, be rejoined in the present application in the form of newly presented claims 41-46. Claims 7-9 and 13-15 previously were withdrawn from consideration pursuant to a restriction requirement that has been made final. Newly presented dependent claim 41 is directed to a method for restricting use of



a clipboard application, and recites features that correspond to features of original dependent claim 7. Claim 42 depends from claim 41 and recites features that correspond to features of original claim 8. Claim 43 depends from claim 42 and recites features that correspond to features of original claim 9. Newly presented dependent claim 44 is directed to a method for restricting use of a clipboard application, and recites features that correspond to features of original dependent claim 13. Claim 45 depends from claim 44 and recites features that correspond to features of original claim 14. Claim 46 depends from claim 45 and recites features that correspond to features of original claim 15. No new matter has been added.

Claims 41-46 depend from claim 1 and are believed allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with regards to claim 1. Moreover, each of these dependent claims recites additional features in combination with the allowable features of base claim 1.

Applicant respectfully requests that the subject matter of original claims 7-9 and 13-15, previously withdrawn pursuant to the restriction requirement, be rejoined in the form of newly presented claims 41-46.

***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Glenn J. Perry  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 28,458

Date: 15 July 2009

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934  
(202) 371-2600

1002955\_1.DOC